DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 132 428 CE 009 255

AUTHOR Hoyt, Kenneth
TITLE Career Education for Special Populations. Monographs on Career Education.
INSTITUTION Office of Career Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 26p.; For these papers as separate documents see ED 108 431, ED 109 459, and EC 090 986
AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (Stock Number 017-080-01612-5, $0.45, minimum charge $1.00 for each mail order)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Education; Definitions; *Educational Needs; Educational Problems; Elementary Secondary Education; Employment Opportunities; Employment Potential; Exceptional Child Education; *Gifted; *Handicapped Students; *Low Income Groups; *Minority Groups; Needs Assessment; Student Development; Work Attitudes

ABSTRACT

The three papers included in this monograph represent attempts on the part of the Office of Career Education to face the need for improving delivery of career education to special portions of the population. The first paper, "Career Education for Minority and Low-Income Persons," states that for this segment of the population, career education has been a matter of over-promise and under-delivery. Promises and problems are discussed in three categories: (1) Conceptual assumptions of career education, (2) process assumptions of career development, and (3) programmatic assumptions of career education. The second paper, "Career Education for Gifted and Talented Persons," discusses some of the special problems involved in developing career education programs for gifted and talented students, such as career decisionmaking, the development of talent, and work experience. In the third paper, "Career Education and the Handicapped Person," statistical predictions concerning underemployment and unemployment of handicapped high school graduates during the next four years are cited to emphasize the need for making career education opportunities available. Stressed as particularly relevant for the handicapped are basic career education principles such as the right to choose from a wide range of personally meaningful work opportunities and emphasis on accomplishments and discovery of an individual's talents rather than his limitations. (TA)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED132428

MONOGRAPHS ON CAREER EDUCATION

# CAREER EDUCATION FOR SPECIAL POPULATIONS

by

Kenneth Hoyt, *Director*
Office of Career Education
Office of Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE**
David Mathews, *Secretary*
Virginia Y. Trotter, *Assistant Secretary for Education*

**Office of Education**
Edward Aguirre, *Commissioner*

CE 009 355

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON: 1976

---

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price: 45 cents
Stock Number 017-080-01612-5
There is a minimum charge of $1.00 for each mail order

## PREFACE

Career education represents an effort to help all persons understand and capitalize on the changing relationships between education and work—paid or unpaid. As such, it is certainly for such special portions of the population as the handicapped, minority and low income persons, and the gifted/talented of the nation.

The Office of Career Education, USOE, has systematically included demonstration projects in career education for such groups since it was organized under P.L. 93-380. With only $10 million available for *all* career education demonstration projects, the OCE efforts have been relatively small. The smallness of the effort is in no way related to our perception of the importance of the problem

The three papers included here represent attempts, on the part of the Office of Career Education, to squarely face the need for improving the delivery of career education to special portions of the population. Each represents an attempt to both conceptualize the nature of the effort needed and to emphasize the importance of the effort. During the last two years, consultative assistance, from experts in each of the three areas represented in these papers, has been sought by and given to the Office of Career Education, U.S. Office of Education. In general, these consultants have appeared to be in fairly high agreement regarding the conceptual views found in these three papers.

It is hoped that these three papers may, by being combined here, serve a useful national purpose in calling attention to the problem and in encouraging a national effort to move toward solutions.

## CONTENTS


| | *Page* |
|---|---|
| Preface | iii |
| Career Education for Minority and Low-Income Persons | 1 |
| Career Education for Gifted and Talented Persons | 9 |
| Career Education and the Handicapped Person | 16 |

## CAREER EDUCATION FOR MINORITY AND LOW-INCOME PERSONS

Career education, for minority and low-income persons, has, to date, been generally a matter of over-promise and under-delivery. The expertise assembled here will hopefully be dedicated to correcting this situation, not to denying its validity through the splendid examples of practice to be presented. Such examples will be better viewed as pointing the way toward progress than in denying the truth of this accusation. If this happens, we should be able to devise a "career education game plan" that will be superior to any particular example presented here. Let this be our goal.

To build positively demands that we be willing to look realistically at both promises and at problems in three categories: (1) conceptual assumptions of career education; (2) process assumptions of career development; and (3) programmatic assumptions of career education. By devoting this presentation primarily to a discussion of these assumptions, the resources to be discussed during the remainder of the conference should assume greater relevance.

To discuss each major kind of assumption fully and completely would require a very large book. Here, only a brief outline of each can be presented. I apologize here to those who are sure to accuse me of painting too bleak a picture. Having apologized, I want to move ahead. That is, in my opinion, if I present a problem that has no basis in reality, you can readily dismiss it. I simply ask that we face those that cannot be dismissed.

### Conceptual Assumptions of Career Education

Two basic conceptual assumptions of career education constitute serious operational challenges when we seek to meet the needs of minority and low-income students. One of these assumptions is that career education is for all persons. The second is that career education is humanistically oriented. Both assumptions require brief discussion here.

From the outset, we have pictured career education as an emphasis for all persons, at all educational levels, in all settings in our society. We have said that career education should be available to very young children and to adults in the retirement years—to males and to females—to the physically and mentally handicapped and to gifted and talented persons—to high school dropouts and to college graduates—to the rich and to the poor. We have said that ALL persons

need to know, understand, and act on the increasingly close relationships between education and work that exist in our society at the present time. The assumption, in my opinion, is sound and must be preserved.

This audience need not be reminded that without unequal resources, equality of opportunity is virtually impossible for those who must start out behind. In a democratic society, "poor" is a relative concept. It is inevitable in that some members of society will have more than others. Thus, in a relative sense, the presence of poor people does not seem evil. What is evil is the assumption that, in generation after generation, lower income persons must always be expected to come from the same families. To make any concept, such as career education, equally available to all is to guarantee that this situation will be perpetuated.

Our philosophy is dedicated to destruction of the cycle of poverty. Possibilities for doing so will be discussed shortly.

The second conceptual promise of career education, for minority and low-income persons, is that it is humanistically oriented. I recognize how strange this statement must sound. If I didn't think I could defend it, I would not have said it.

I have tried to conceptualize career education around a four letter word called "work." In doing so, I have defined work as follows:

> Work is conscious effort, other than activities whose prime purpose is coping or relaxation, aimed at producing benefits for oneself and/or for oneself and others.

This definition obviously includes unpaid work as well as paid employment. Its emphasis on "conscious choice" distinguishes "work" from "labor" that is forced on the person or performed involuntarily. Its emphasis on "producing" refers to the human need of all human beings to *do*–to *accomplish*–to *achieve* something that will allow the individual to *be* someone. Its emphasis on "benefits" illustrates the need we all have to know that somebody needs me for something–that it does make a difference that I exist. Former President Lyndon B. Johnson expressed this need well in a speech when he said "to hunger for use and to go unused is the greatest hunger of all." Career education is dedicated to relieving all persons from the hunger. That is why I say it is humanistically oriented.

It is obvious that career education speaks to what Maslow described as the higher order need for self-actualization. It is equally obvious that, if one follows Maslow, meeting this need is dependent on meeting the more basic needs of survival, security, love, and belonging. We have translated our humanistic orientation for career education into goals that say we seek to make work

possible, meaningful, and satisfying for each individual. In so doing, we, too, have obviously used an ordering of needs approach. That is, work cannot be "meaningful" until it is first "possible." It cannot be "satisfying" unless it is first "meaningful."

For several years, youth unemployment has been approximately three times as great as adult unemployment. Further, unemployment among minority youth has been approximately double than for white youth. Further, unemployment rates for females have been higher than for males. The sickening stability of the statistics takes on added meaning in times when general adult unemployment rates are rising. With unemployment rates in the inner city higher than for the country as a whole, the employment prospects facing minority, low-income youth from inner city environments seem bleak indeed. I have often observed that youth with nothing to do seldom do nothing. It is probably an understatement to say that we face an explosive situation.

The goals of career education can never be met for minority and low-income persons unless major and decisive action is first taken to attack and solve the youth unemployment problem. Survival and security needs, related to work, must take initial precedence over meeting higher order self-actualization needs. It seems both unwise and unproductive to emphasize the personal meaningfulness of volunteer, unpaid work to minority and low-income persons prior to meeting their needs for paid employment. They already know what it's like not to be paid. Unless there is paid employment available at the time students leave school, career education, for minority and low-income youth, is a cop-out.

At the same time, if career education were to content itself only with making work *possible* for minority and low-income youth, the goals of career education would obviously not have been met. We would run the great risk of assigning minority and low-income youth to a life of labor while reserving the personal meaningfulness of work for the more affluent. This simply must not be allowed to happen.

**Process Assumptions Of Career Education**

As a process, career education follows the model of career development. This model envisions a sequence involving, in a progressive manner, (a) career awareness; (b) career exploration; (c) career motivation; (d) career decision-making; (e) career preparation; (f) career entry; and (g) career maintenance and progression. Special problems exist for minority and low-income persons in each stage of this process. Only brief mention of such problems can be made here.

Career awareness aims to acquaint the individual with a broad view of the nature of the world of work–including both unpaid work and the world of paid employment. That world cannot, for most inner-city youth, be seen in its

entirety in their immediate neighborhood. More basic, that world is not known clearly to many of their teachers and counselors, and not to their parents. Problems here are pervasive in most inner-city elementary schools.

Career exploration seeks to help individuals consider possible occupational choices based on their interests and aptitudes coupled with an understanding of the basic nature of various occupations and their requirements for entry. To be effective, career exploration must be more than a vicarious experience. Reading about work is like reading about sex–i.e., it may very well be stimulating but it is seldom satisfying. If minority and low-income youth are to leave their neighborhoods to explore the world of work first-hand, it is vital that they see some persons in that world who are products of low-income inner city neighborhoods. If this cannot be accomplished, career exploration may be more self-defeating than productive for such youth.

Career motivation concerns itself with work values and centers around helping the individual answer the question "Why should *I* work?" If person from a very low-income family are asked whether they value "making money" or "helping people" more, it should not be surprising if they choose economic over altruistic values. The danger, of course, is in assuming that the individual has no altruistic work values. Money, as a sole motivational base, prevents one from developing long-term self-sustaining motivational patterns. Unless minority and low-income youth can be given such a broader motivational base, they cannot be expected to persevere toward full career development.

One of Shelly's poems contains these lines: "Patience and perseverance made a Bishop of His Reverence." Unless motivation can be diverse enough to produce perseverance, minority and low-income youth will find it difficult to afford the luxury of patience.

Career decisionmaking seeks to help the individual answer three questions: (a) what is important to me; (b) what is possible for me; and (c) what is probable for me? We have been more successful in demonstrating probable failure than possible success. Career decisionmaking, for minority and low-income youth, cannot be based simply on increasing self-understanding and understandings of occupational opportunities. Unless it is accompanied by understandings of how to take advantage of such opportunities, it is likely to be more frustrating than helpful in its results.

Decisionmaking is preceded by indecision. It isn't terribly serious to remain occupationally undecided if your father owns the factory. However, for the minority and low-income youth who have immediate economic needs, occupational indecision is a very serious matter indeed. Unless high quality career decision-making assistance is available, pressures of time will continue to force

many such youth to settle for lower levels of occupational aspiration than they should.

Part of career decisionmaking leads to occupational preparation programs. Problems of minority and low-income youth are particularly serious in this area of career development. It is obvious that long-run problems of minorities are dependent, in part, on more minority persons assuming community leadership roles–and that such roles are, at present, largely being taken by college graduates. Thus, there is an absolute necessity for encouraging more minority and low-income persons to attend college. If career education goals are to be met, college attendance will be seen as preparation for work–not simply for a degree. Too many such youth seem still to be regarding the college degree as an end in itself rather than as a means to an end.

While recognizing and emphasizing the great need for more minority persons to become college graduates, it would be both tragic and unfair to fail to emphasize post high school occupational preparation programs at less than the baccalaureate level. There can be no freedom if the full range of possible vocational preparation choices is not made available for choice. Career education cannot ignore or play down opportunities in vocational education for minority and low-income persons simply because more such persons should be going to college. Instead, the widest possible range of educational opportunities must be made freely available for choice on the part of all minority and low-income youth - along with the financial aid necessary for implementing whatever choices such individuals make.

Finally, the continuing problems minority and low-income youth face in career entry and progression must be recognized. In recent years, a relatively great deal of attention has been focused on helping such youth solve problems of career entry. Problems of career progression and advancement are equally important. If career education does not assume an active role in working with others to solve such problems, it will not have been beneficial, to the extent it has promised to be, for minority and low-income youth.

**Programmatic Assumptions Of Career Education**

Finally, I would like to comment briefly on three programmatic assumptions of career education that are currently acting as operational deterrents to effective career education for minority and low-income persons. These are: (a) the assumption that career education is a collaborative effort; (b) the assumption that the classroom teacher is key to the success of career education; and (c) the assumption that career education is inexpensive.

From the beginning, career education has been pictured as a collaborative effort involving the formal educational system, the home and family, and the

business-labor-industry-professional-government community. The strength of a given community's career education effort is dependent on the strength of each of these three collaborative forces.

Given this view, problems for minority and low-income students become immediately apparent. The inner city school, when compared with its counterparts in the suburbs, is often seen as poor as its student body. Career education depends greatly on parents to teach positive work values, good work habits, and to assist youth in career decisionmaking. Adults living in the homes of many minority and low-income youth are, at present, not well prepared to accept such responsibilities. Career education counts heavily on the business-labor-industry-professional-government community to provide observational, work experience, and work-study opportunities for students. Further, it depends on the willingness and availability of members of that community to serve as resource persons in the classroom. If the business-labor-industry-professional-government community is limited to the immediate neighborhood of the inner city, a lack of both quantity and quality of effort is almost sure to be felt.

All three parts of this collaborative effort—the schools, the home and family structure, and the business-labor-industry-professional-government community must be strengthened if quality career education is to be provided for minority and low-income youth.

A second programmatic assumption is that the classroom teacher is key to the success of career education. Career education asks the teacher to use the community as a learning laboratory in which students can see career implications of subject matter. It asks that we open up the community to students and teachers for field trips and for "hands-on" experiences. It asks that many persons from the community be brought into the schools to serve as career education resource persons. It asks the teacher to use a project approach to teaching and to emphasize a "success approach," based on individualization of instruction, to the teaching learning process. The many inner-city teachers who, day after day, find crowded classrooms, danger on the streets, and pupils who can't read find it difficult to become enthusiastic about the pleas and visions of career education. The problems of many are compounded by their own lack of experience in or contact with the world of work outside of formal education.

The third programmatic assumption of career education is that it is inexpensive. This assumption is based, in part, on the fact that career education asks neither for new buildings nor for large increases in staff. It seeks to be infused into all subjects rather than being added on as yet another part of the curriculum. In part, this assumption rests on a belief that, if youth are prepared for work and willing to work, they will find work that is satisfying to themselves and beneficial to society.

In the case of minority and low-income youth, this entire assumption appears to be erroneous. It is going to cost sizeable sums of money to give inner-city teachers the kind of inservice education they will need to work in career education. Parent education programs for career education in the inner-city will require special staff and so cost money. Similarly, field trips and work experience sites for minority and low-income youth cannot be limited to the inner city itself, but must extend out a considerable distance. This, too, will require staff and equipment and so cost money.

Career development programs, for minority and inner-city youth, must, if they are to be effective, be both heavily staffed and equipped with a wide variety of career exploration and decisionmaking equipment. All of this will be expensive. Finally, the largest costs will be those connected with guaranteeing access to post high school educational programs and to real, bonafide employment for minority and inner-city youth. Unless both are purchased, neither will be available and career education will have been yet another hoax society has played on such youth.

**Concluding Remarks**

In raising these problems career education faces in meeting needs of minority and low-income youth, I, in no way, intend to imply that I know immediate and effective solutions that can now be applied in solving them. At the same time, I find myself full of several beliefs regarding solutions to those problems. I would be less than honest here if I failed to state their general nature.

First, I am convinced that, of all the things needed, money must surely beat, by a very wide margin, whatever is in second place. Even more important, we need other branches of government - the U.S. Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Defense–and many others to join forces in emphasizing and implementing relationships between education and work in our society. We need the business-labor-industry-professional community to recognize that they, too, have a stake in attaining the goals of career education. Finally, it seems to me that, in spite of our past failures to do so, we need to encourage the churches of the nation to become involved in career education. They have a key role to play in problems involving value decisions and personal judgments.

Second, I am convinced that, in spite of the problems I have specified here, career education can be a reality for minority and for inner-city youth. Many examples exist throughout the United States where effective actions are already being taken. The conference program here is filled with some of the better examples. Many others exist who could not be brought here. In no way are the problems of providing effective career education for minority and inner-city

youth incapable of solution. We need to build on the many good examples that now exist and go forward together.

Third, I am convinced that career education holds great promise for meeting major current needs of minority and inner-city youth. If, as a nation, we committed ourselves to career education for such youth, it would pay big dividends both in terms of bringing personal meaning and meaningfulness to their lives and in terms of bringing great benefits to the larger society. Career education is a winner. We should not abandon its implementation simply because formidable problems need to be solved. The best way to begin is to begin. And I think we should.

Finally, I am convinced that, in the absence of a sound and comprehensive career education effort, problems of minority and inner-city youth will surely become more complex for them and more difficult for society in the years ahead. We cannot continue to do what we have done in the past. Career education offers a positive, action program for change It seems to me to be worth trying.

## CAREER EDUCATION FOR GIFTED AND TALENTED PERSONS

It has been almost two years since Jean Hebeler and I collaborated in writing and editing a set of papers in a book entitled *Career Education for Gifted and Talented Students.* I have no good idea of the number of copies that have been distributed. My impression is that it is not on the "best seller" list. At the same time, I have heard reports that several thousand copies have been sold.

The most common question I receive concerning that book is usually stated in the form of "Why in the world did you choose to write a book on that topic?" The question used to amuse me, and I would usually respond with some answer which, in effect, said that I did the book in order to emphasize the fact that career education was for more than vocational education students. I don't say that anymore for two reasons. First, I have ceased to be amused by the question and am now somewhat angered when I hear it. Second, as I have thought more about career education for gifted and talented persons, it has become increasingly obvious that some such persons are in vocational education—thus making my original answer patently inappropriate.

The conversion of "career education" from an idea to a full-blown concept is still in process. However, even two years ago, certain basic elements in the career education concept were clearly in place—elements that served as ample justification for a book on that topic. Included among those conceptual elements were the following:

1. Career education is for all persons (including the gifted and talented).

2. Career education seeks to: (a) help all individuals understand and capitalize on relationships between education and work; and (b) make work a more meaningful part of the total lifestyle of all persons.

3. Career education is committed to combatting race, sex, and cultural barriers to full freedom of career choices for all persons.

4. Career education stresses both paid and unpaid work in its conceptual efforts. Unpaid work includes the work of the volunteer and work in which persons engage in productive use of leisure time.

Such elements clearly pointed to the appropriateness of considering the topic of career education for gifted and talented persons. Each, however, was small in comparison to the appropriateness our definition of "work" held for gifted and talented persons. The definition in the book Jean Hebeler and I did was, with some slight modification, the same definition I am currently using. The definition is:

> "WORK" is conscious effort, other than activities whose primary purpose is either coping or relaxation, aimed at producing benefits for oneself and/or for oneself and others.

That definition, in addition to making clear the fact that we include unpaid work as well as the world of paid employment in our considerations, hopefully also makes clear that we are talking about the basic human need for all human beings to do–to achieve–to accomplish things that will allow the individual to gain greater insight into both who she or he is and why she or he exists. It is a very humanistic need–the need we all have to feel that someone needs ME for something–that it does make a difference that I exist–that, because I exist, the world is in some way and to some extent, better off. Certainly, the humanistic nature of this concept of work makes it mandatory that gifted and talented persons be included among the intended recipients of a total career education effort.

As we were working on the book, certain problems in the delivery of effective career education to gifted and talented became clear. Some of these have become even more clear to me since the book was published. It is my purpose here to comment specifically on four broad problems, each of which entails a number of sub-problems. By sharing them with you here, I hope that the prime result will be our joint concentration on finding solutions to each, not simply commenting on its presence or absence.

**Career Decisionmaking for Gifted and Talented Persons**

Three of the special challenges present in providing effective career education for gifted and talented persons are in the arena of career decisionmaking. One of these is centered around special difficulties involved in emphasizing education, as preparation for work, with highly intellectually gifted persons. This emphasis, as you know, underlies much of the operational efforts of career education. We have repeatedly said that the purpose of education cannot be simply education–that persons do not go to school simply so that they can go on to still more school. Rather, we have tried to emphasize that education must be regarded as preparation for something–for making a living, for appreciating life, for enjoying self-fulfillment in life, for good citizenship, for good physical and mental health, for anything else that could be said to represent a basic aim of American education.

In short, we have encouraged students to think beyond schooling and to consider what they plan to do with their schooling after they have first left the domain of formal education. For some intellectually gifted persons, this challenge has understandably met with little appeal. That is, such persons often find the atmosphere of academia quite congenial with their interests and preferred lifestyles. After all, they know they can not only succeed, but also

excel if their competition is limited to a purely academic environment. Most of them are also aware of the fact that, were they to leave the academic "nest" for the world of paid employment, their chances of remaining at the top of whatever competitive "pile" they find themselves in will be diminished. That is, they know that, in the world of paid employment, factors other than pure intellectual and academic aptitude play a major role in determining what is known as "success." Some have understandably reasoned that they prefer to stay in the academic environment where they can always be assured of a position of excellence. Thus, when they hear career education urge them to prepare themselves for the world of paid employment, they sometimes find themselves less than enthusiastic about the prospects. In my opinion, this, in no way, makes our emphasis on education, as preparation for work, any less important for gifted and talented persons. It simply means that this emphasis may meet with more initial resistance.

A second career decisionmaking problem faced by the intellectually gifted, in particular, is their multipotentiality. Such persons are apt to be interested in a wide variety of areas and to find that they excell in almost everything they try. When, as in typical career decisionmaking exercises, we attempt to help persons narrow their consideration of possible occupations through discovering those in which they lack interest or aptitude–or both, we often find that very little narrowing occurs for many intellectually gifted persons. Some, especially if they discover this during that wonderful "age of absolutism" known as "adolescence," must surely wonder why they have difficulty narrowing their career choices. To point out, as we must, that such persons can probably find equally productive and satisfying lifestyles in a variety of occupational pursuits, does not do much to relieve the kinds of anxieties some such persons find themselves enduring.

A third problem for the intellectually gifted is that encountered when the process of career decisionmaking places heavy emphasis on the current nature of the world of paid employment. The current and expected continuing rapidity of occupational change found in our society makes it generally inadvisable to concentrate much attention on the specific nature of the world of paid employment during the career awareness stage of career education typically carried out in elementary schools. However, when students reach the senior high school level, typical career education efforts carry a substantial concentration of effort on accumulation of this kind of knowledge. In the case of the highly intellectually gifted person, such an emphasis may be questionable even at the senior high school level–especially for the gifted person who is also highly creative. That is, these are the very persons who, as adults, will contribute most to the continuing rapidity of occupational change. For many, it will not be so much a matter of "discovering" occupations as it will a matter of "inventing" new occupations that never before existed. When this combination of giftedness

and creativity is apparent in a given student, problems of appropriate directions for assistance in career decisionmaking become very great indeed.

**The Development of Talent**

If we move from consideration of the intellectually gifted person to the broader domain of the talented, a whole host of other problems emerge. One such problem, for example, is found for persons possessing talents which, if they are to fully mature, must begin having concentrated attention at a very early age. A prime example is the person who has the potential to become a talented violinist. There seems to be an abundance of evidence to indicate that this talent is one that should be nurtured beginning in the very early years if it is to be fully developed. We have all seen the results of this emphasis expressed by the various sizes of violins available for use by little children that gradually become larger as the child develops physical maturity. The fact that this does not appear to be a matter of serious concern for other talents - for example, among those will be talented in playing the clarinet–makes it so less a serious problem where it exists.

A second, and related, problem exists for talented persons who make concentrated efforts to develop their talents during their youth–namely, the risk that their full development, as human beings, may be diminished in other important respects. This, too, is a problem that defies any simple or universal solution. We know that it exists and that, for some highly talented persons, it may have adverse effects when career development is seen as more important than other aspects of human growth and development.

A third problem especially important for career education lies in the definition of "talent." I was, in one sense, relieved to discover that there exists no apparent consensus even among those who have devoted their professional lives to the study of gifted and talented persons when problems of definition are raised. Some seem intent on making clear distinctions between the terms "gifted" and "talented" while others seem to regard the two as synonymous in meaning. I have discovered that some seem to limit their operational definition of "talent" to the arts and humanities area while others seem intent on talking about talents in the psychomotor and affective areas as well as those existing among artists, musicians, and actors. My own personal view is one that holds it desirable to broaden the definition of "talent" just as broadly as possible while, at the same time, restricting the definition of "gifted" primarily to those with exceptionally high levels of academic aptitude. I suspect this may be more due to my ignorance than to my insights into the matter. At the same time, in attempting to conceptualize career education, it has seemed desirable to me to consider the possibility that "talented" auto mechanics, machinists, electricians, and barbers may very well exist along with "talented" artists, musicians, and actors. That is, I do not find it personally comfortable to limit a view of what

is "talented" to occupations that typically are classified as being "professional" in nature.

**Work Experience for Gifted and Talented Persons**

Career education has, from its inception, placed a strong emphasis on combining a "learning-to-do" with a "doing-to-learn" emphasis primarily through entering into collaborative relationships between the formal educational system, the business-labor-industry-professional-government community, and the home and family structure. We have asked that, as part of the career exploration phase of career development, observational, work experience, and work-study opportunities be provided for students at the secondary and post-secondary levels. Again, we find an aspect of career education that poses a special set of challenges with respect to gifted and talented persons.

Traditionally, American secondary education has thought of both "work experience" and "work-study" as special programs largely reserved for vocational education students. If, as career education proposes, education—as preparation for work—is to become a major goal of ALL who teach and of ALL who learn, both work experience and work-study must be thought of as general educational methodologies, not as specific kinds of educational programs. The skills and knowledges accumulated over the years by vocational education personnel assigned such functions must be shared with the total faculty—or, at the very least, be made available to the entire student body. This has, to some extent, already begun for gifted and talented students in certain parts of the country under a variety of arrangements. For example, in one Maryland school with whom I have worked (Winston Churchill), this responsibility has been assumed by the academic faculty while, in another Maryland school, the work-study specialist in vocational education has added the gifted and talented to the students served by his staff (Townson High School). In most schools, however, we have yet to see this problem directly attacked, let alone solved.

A second problem, especially for highly talented students, is one of finding talented persons in the community with whom they could acquire work experience. In the case of intellectually gifted students, it is obviously not difficult to place students with lawyers, M.D.s, engineers, etc. for purposes of exploring possible occupational choices. It may be quite a different matter in the case of the talented prospective painter living in a small town in rural America. In some large urban areas, this problem has been solved by bringing talented persons from the community into the school system to assist in talent development of outstanding students. The New Orleans Center for the Cultural Arts in Career Education, under the direction of Ms. Shirley Trusty, is a good example.

**The Freedom to Choose**

Of all the operational problems to be faced in making career education for gifted and talented persons an operational reality, none is more serious or more crucial than that concerned with protecting individual freedom of choice. Here, we come face to face with several of the bedrock concepts of career education that must be made clear to those charged with responsibility for helping gifted and talented persons.

One crucial problem is found when one considers the apparently prevailing cultural mores that holds intellectually gifted persons as destined for college attendance. It is almost as though society has "sentenced" such persons to going to college, no matter what the interests or desires of the individual may be. Career education holds that no student should be sentenced to going to college because her or his measured I.Q. reaches a particular level. Rather, we have contended that freedom to attend college or to select other post high school opportunities should be made fully available to all students—including the intellectually gifted. It may well be that, on occasion, we may find such a student whose prime occupational interest lies in becoming an auto mechanic. Career education has contended that such a student has every right to exercise this option and that, furthermore, our society would not really suffer greatly if she or he were to do so.

A related problem has to do with the apparent societal mores that holds gifted and talented persons have a responsibility to develop their gifts and talents to the fullest possible extent. While career education advocates plead that such students should know and be fully aware of opportunities for talent development, we plead equally strongly that the presence of such opportunities should be viewed as a right of the individual, not as a responsibility forced on the student by society.

Third, many seem to be operating under an assumption that gifted and talented persons should use their gifts and talents in the world of paid employment. Career education advocates make no such pretenses. On the contrary, we feel that there will be some, and perhaps many, gifted and talented persons whose system of personal values center around lifestyles that do not attach great significance to the world of paid employment nor to the economic returns to be reaped from that world. There are many gifted and talented persons who may prefer to labor (not work) in the world of paid employment in a rather menial job in order to have the kind of lifestyle that will allow them to gain the personal meaningfulness of true work through using their gifts and talents as part of their productive use of leisure time. Again, we feel strongly that students have, and should be allowed to exercise, this right. It is not at all inconceivable that one could encounter a highly talented musician, for example, who chooses to produce music only in the solitude of his or her own home. If

such a person chooses not to share such a talent with any other person, this, in no way, means that the talent had not been used in work—nor that the talent has been wasted. While we certainly do hope that work will become a meaningful part of the total lifestyle of all individuals, we do not expect that all will choose to find work only in the world of paid employment.

**Concluding Remarks**

In this presentation, I have tried to outline special problems facing those of us concerned with providing effective career education to gifted and talented persons. It should surprise no one that special problems are present. It is my hope that these problems have been presented here in a positive fashion—i.e., in a fashion that makes it clear that each is certainly capable of resolution and/or solution. It was hopefully no accident that the recently-enacted Special Projects Act provided sequential sections for career education, for gifted and talented, for women's equity, for community schools, for consumer education, and for arts and humanities. I like to think that all of these can and should be blended into a composite pattern of change in our American system of education. If this is to come about, it will be essential that those concerned with each area share with each other and work together in the interest of the students we all seek to serve.

In my opinion, a career education program is incomplete indeed if it does not provide a clear emphasis on and concern for gifted and talented persons. Similarly, it would seem to me that an emphasis on the gifted and talented would be equally incomplete if it did not include a concern for and involvement in career education. I hope it seems that way to you.

## CAREER EDUCATION AND THE HANDICAPPED PERSON

Career Education represents a response to a call for educational reform. This call has arisen from a variety of sources, each of which has voiced dissatisfaction with American education as it currently exists. Such sources include students, parents, the business-labor-industry-professional community, and the general public. Special segments of the population, including the economically disadvantaged, minorities, the handicapped, and gifted persons have also expressed deep dissatisfaction with both the appropriateness and the adequacy of educational opportunities that are made available to them. While their specific concerns vary, all seem to agree that American education is in need of major reform at all levels. Career Education is properly viewed as *one* of several possible responses that could be given to this call.

Career Education seeks to respond to this call for change through making education as preparation for work both a prominent and a permanent goal of our entire educational system. To accomplish this goal, career education seeks first to unite all segments of the formal educational system in this common effort. To this, we seek to add the collaborative efforts of both the business-labor-industry-professional community and the home and family structure in ways that enhance attainment of this goal for all persons through a broad range of community services and activities.

From the beginning, career education advocates have proclaimed that they seek to serve *all* persons of all ages in all kinds of educational settings. In practice, we have seen career education programs primarily limited to elementary and secondary school youth enrolled in regular public school programs. This situation cannot continue if the promises of career education are to be attained. In this article, the problem will be illustrated through considering implications of career education for handicapped persons.

### Basic Definitions Essential for Understanding Career Education

Six basic words must be redefined in order to understand the concept of career education itself. These six words are: (1) "work"; (2) "career"; (3) "vocation"; (4) "occupation"; (5) "leisure"; and (6) "education."

*"Work" is conscious effort aimed at producing benefits for oneself and/or for oneself and others.* As such, it is unimportant whether such effort is paid or unpaid in nature. What is important is that it represent the basic need of all human beings to achieve—to accomplish—to *do* something productive that allows the individual to discover both who he/she is and why he/she is. With this definition, work is properly viewed as a human right—not as a societal obligation.

*"Career" is the totality of work one does in his or her lifetime.* Thus, any person can have only one career. That career typically begins prior to entering formal schooling and continues well into the retirement years.

*"Vocation" is one's primary work role at any given point in time.* Vocations include paid employment, but they also extend to unpaid work roles. For example, we can speak of the "vocation" of the student, the full-time volunteer worker, or the full-time homemaker just as easily as we can speak about the "vocation" of the plumber, the physician, or the engineer.

*"Occupation" is one's primary work role in the world of paid employment.* Economic returns are always considered among the work values of persons engaged in occupations although these might not be considered at all by persons in certain vocations. The occupations of many persons will be synonomous with their vocations. One can never have an occupation without having a vocation although, of course, one can have a "vocation" without being engaged in an "occupation."

*"Leisure" consists of activities, other than sleeping, in which one engages when not performing in his or her vocation.* Thus, "leisure" holds possibilities for both "work" and for "play."

*"Education" consists of all those activities and experiences through which one learns.* As such, it is obviously a lifelong process and considerably broader in meaning than the term "schooling."

All that follows is based on an assumption that these six basic words are understood and their meanings agreed upon. Those who disagree with one or more of these definitions will necessarily find themselves disagreeing with much of the remainder of this presentation.

With the way in which these six terms are defined, "career education's" definition, in a generic sense, becomes simple and straightforward. *Career Education consists of all those activities and experiences through which one learns about work.* As such, it makes no restrictions in meaning whether one speaks about work of the homemaker, the musician, the lawyer, or the bricklayer. Some work will require advanced college degrees while other work may include no formal schooling of any kind. Some work will be in the form of primary work roles, paid or unpaid, while other work will be carried out as part of one's leisure time. To the extent that work is judged "successful," it does typically–and, in these times, increasingly–require some learned set of vocational skills.

**Further Consideration of the Meaning of Work**

The preceding definition of "career education" brings us back to further consideration of the meaning and implications of the four letter word "work." Work, as used here, is a concept available only to human beings in that it is restricted to conscious effort - to something that the individual thinks about and chooses to do. It is this quality of conscious choice that most clearly distinguishes the word "work" from the word "labor." That it, "labor," like "work," may very well result in production of benefits, but it does not carry with it the connotation of something that the individual consciously chooses to do. Instead, "labor" is more accurately regarded as forced, involuntary effort that lacks personal meaningfulness and significance for those who perform it.

Why do people work? Answers given to this question can be grouped into three broad classifications of reasons - economic, sociological, and psychological. Work, in the world of paid employment, always includes economic reasons and, if maximally meaningful to the individual, carries sociological and psychological reasons as well. Economic reasons, of course, center around the needs most of us have to accumulate income so that we can purchase goods, products, or services produced through the work of others. Sociological reasons center around recognition that one's work contributes to the goals of our society in a positive way–that what one does has benefit for one's fellow human beings. Psychological reasons center around personal recognition of one's accomplishments–around the feeling of being *someone* through being able to say that one has accomplished *something*.

While most persons experience economic reasons for working and many, although not all, can readily observe the sociological significance of the work that they do, the single reason for working that can be said to apply to all persons is that which centers around the psychological dimension. Former President Lyndon Johnson perhaps expressed this need for work as clearly as anyone when, in a speech, he said

> To hunger for use and to go unused is the greatest hunger of all.

He was, of course, referring to the human need of all human beings to feel that someone needs them for something–that it does matter to someone that they exist–that, because they are alive, the world is, in some way and to some degree better off.

The concerns and scope of career education extend to all three of these basic reasons for working. It is this breadth of concern that enables career education to say that it is concerned with all persons of all ages in all settings from all levels of educational background. The basic premise of career education is that the need to work is a basic human need for all human beings. That is why we refer to work as a "human right" rather than as a "societal obligation."

**Career Education and Handicapped Persons**

In a recent paper, C. Samuel Barone, USOE Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, presented the following predictions regarding the approximately 2.5 million handicapped youth who will leave our school systems in the next four years:

525,000 - 21% - will be either fully employed or enrolled in college.

1,000,000 - 40% - will be *underemployed* and at the poverty level.

200,000 - 8% - will be in their home community and idle much of the time.

650,000 - 26% - will be unemployed and on welfare.

75,000 - 3% - will be totally dependent and institutionalized.*

Predications, such as these, raise very grave concerns for those dedicated to the career education movement. The prediction that one million of these handicapped youth will be *underemployed* is a very serious matter indeed. The concept of underemployment is one that pictures a person as possessing greater degrees of productive capability than the tasks he or she is asked to perform routinely require. Underemployment leads to boredom on the job and is seen by many as a major contributor to worker alienation in our society at the present time. To predict that this will be the fate of 2 out of every 5 handicapped youth leaving our school system in the next four years can only be regarded as a serious indictment of our educational system and of the larger society.

We have, for far too long, seemed to act as though a handicapped person should be both pleased with and grateful for any kind of work society provides. Unlike other persons, we seem to assume that, if a person is handicapped, boredom on a job is impossible. Worse, much of society has seemed to assume that, while most persons should seek work compatible with their interests and aptitudes, such consideration are not necessary when seeking to find employment for handicapped persons. If *any* job in the world of paid employment can be found for the handicapped person, we seem far too often to be personally relieved and surprised when the handicapped person is anything less than effusively grateful.

Similarly, we seem to assume that those handicapped persons who are not employed in the world of paid employment are not and cannot be working. This is, in the philosophy of career education, both false and wrong. We know that, for example, the fact that a person is unemployed and on welfare certainly does not mean, for many such persons, that they do not work. There is a very great deal of work being carried out in many welfare homes, the results of which are

readily apparent to any who visit in such homes. Yet, because persons on welfare are not engaged in the world of paid employment, society seems to assume that they are not working. Even more tragic, some seem to assume that people on welfare do not want to work. If the human need to work pictured here has any validity at all, it certainly applies to persons on welfare just as to all other persons.

The 200,000 youth who are predicted to be in their home community and idle much of the time can certainly not be written off as persons with no interest in working or no personal needs to work. Something should be provided for such persons, whether it be paid or unpaid work. The field of the handicapped has, for years, be promiting the concept of the sheltered workshop for those who are unable to compete effectively in the world of paid employment. The prime rationale for the sheltered workshop must surely lie in recognition of the human need for work that is being discussed here. If this concept is valid for those in sheltered workshops, it is certainly also valid for those who are not.

Career education seeks to make work possible, meaningful, and satisfying for *all* individuals. To do so for handicapped persons demands, first of all, that we regard their right to choose from among the widest possible set of opportunities equally as important as for any other individual. We seem too often to be satisfied when we have found *something* that a handicapped person can do. We should be dissatisfied until and unless we have explored, to the fullest possible extent, the total array of work that might be possible for a given handicapped person. To stop prior to reaching this point is being less than fair to the handicapped person and to the larger society.

One further basic principle of the career education movement would seem to have some relevance for handicapped persons. This is the principle that holds that we should seek to emphasize the individual's successes, not his or her failures. In career education, a conscientious attempt is made to emphasize accomplishments–attainments–achievements–*doing*. This can best be carried out by refusing to emphasize failures and shortcomings. It would seem that this principle holds some positive potential for working with handicapped persons who, far too often, are made well aware of their limitations and, in the process, effectively limited in discovering their talents. We have, it would seem, been sometimes too much concerned about helping the handicapped realize and appreciate how much society is doing *for* them. In so doing, we run the risk of de-emphasizing, for many handicapped persons, how much each can do for himself or herself.

Handicapped persons are as deserving of whatever benefits career education has to offer as are any other individuals. To date, not many career education programs have made the kinds of special efforts necessary in order to make career education a reality for handicapped persons. It is hoped that these

remarks may stimulate both those in career education and those working in the field of the handicapped to work together in order to correct this lack of attention. The need to work *is* a human need of all human beings. Handicapped persons *are* human beings.

CE 009 255



GPO 808-582